

**City of Seattle**  
**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT APPLICATION**

Use this application to propose a change in the policies, future land use map, appendices, or other components of the adopted City of Seattle Comprehensive Plan. Applications are due to the Seattle City Council no later than 5:00 p.m. on May 15th for consideration in the next annual review cycle. Any proposals received after May 15th will be considered in the review process for the following year.

Date: May 10, 2012

Applicant: Mark Knoke

Mailing Address: 2147 North 130th Street

City: Seattle State: Washington Zip: 98133 Phone: 206-819-6154

Email: sotosoroto@yahoo.com

Name of general area, location, or site that would be affected by this proposed change in text:

Pinehurst and Haller Lake neighborhoods

If the application is approved for further consideration by the City Council, the applicant may be required to submit a State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) checklist.

Acceptance of this application does not guarantee final approval.

Applicant

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: May 10, 12

Attachment A

## **REQUIRED QUESTIONNAIRE: Comprehensive Plan Amendment Application**

Please answer the following questions in text and attach them to the application. Supporting maps or graphics may be included. Please answer all questions separately and reference the question number in your answer. The Council will consider an application incomplete unless all the questions are answered. When proposing an amendment, you must show that a change to the Comprehensive Plan is required.

1. Provide a detailed description of the proposed amendment and a clear statement of what the proposed amendment is intended to accomplish. Include the name(s) of the Comprehensive Plan Element(s) (Land Use, Transportation, etc) you propose to amend.

c. If the amendment is to the Future Land Use Map, please provide a map that clearly outlines the area proposed to be changed.

A map showing the proposed changes to the Future Land Use Map is attached. The changes are between Interlake Avenue North, 19th Avenue Northeast, Northeast 113th Street, and Northeast 137th Street.

The attached map shows the proposed boundaries of the Pinehurst Hub Urban Village and the Haller Lake Residential Urban Village, as well as an addition to the Northgate Urban Center alongside 5th Avenue Northeast, south of Northeast 117th Street.

Certain areas within these urban villages are modified to multi-family residential and commercial/mixed-use in this proposal, as shown on the map. The commercial/mixed-use would be along arterial streets, while the multi-family residential would be along non-arterial streets within easy walking distance of the future light rail station at I-5 and Northeast 130th Street.

2. Describe how the issue is currently addressed in the Comprehensive Plan. If the issue is not adequately addressed, describe the need for it.

The Pinehurst and Haller Lake neighborhoods are not directly addressed in the Comprehensive Plan, since neither currently has an urban village. Since it is becoming increasingly possible that Sound Transit will construct a Link Light Rail station between I-5 and 5th Avenue Northeast near Northeast 130th Street, it behooves us to prepare for this future change in our infrastructure and land use capacity. The surrounding neighborhoods should become part of the urban fabric of our city.

Sound Transit is currently writing a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Lynnwood Link Extension, which will consider matters such as land use when evaluating the potential of a light rail station at Northeast 130th Street.

Attachment A

Sound Transit is far more likely to locate a station here, and receive federal funding for their project, if the future land use indicates there will be a high population in the area. The next fifteen months are critical to this project, this proposal, and this city.

3. Describe why the proposed change meets the criteria adopted in Resolution 30662 for considering an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. The criteria are listed at the end of this application form. Is a Comprehensive Plan amendment the best means for meeting the identified public need? What other options are there for meeting the identified public need?

A. The local neighborhood plan for Broadview - Bitter Lake - Haller Lake, currently being revised, does not address the issue of a future light rail station at I-5 and Northeast 130th Street. The focus of that plan is on the area between Aurora Avenue North and Linden Avenue North. If a neighborhood plan is necessary, the Haller Lake and Pinehurst neighborhoods would be better served by a separate neighborhood plan for the area between Ashworth Avenue North, 20th Avenue Northeast, Northeast 115th Street, and Northeast 145th Street.

B. These changes are legal.

C1. Sound Transit will be completing their Draft Environmental Impact Statement in late 2013 and their Final Environmental Impact Statement in mid-2015. The city will have sufficient time to study this issue and inform Sound Transit of its decision so that Sound Transit can incorporate these changes into its reports. There is no time for delay, however.

C2. These changes to the Future Land Use Map are consistent with the vision in the Comprehensive Plan.

C3. Although a neighborhood plan has ostensibly been written for this area, these changes will require the formulation of a new neighborhood plan.

4. What do you anticipate will be the impacts caused by the change in text, including the geographic area affected and the issues presented? Why will the proposed change result in a net benefit to the community?

The Pinehurst and Haller Lake neighborhoods will undergo a significant change from this proposal. An area that has been a quiet corner of suburbia for half a century will transform into a dense urban environment, as befitting the area surrounding a mass-transit station. Some residents in our neighborhood will undoubtedly complain, but these changes are necessary if Seattle is to grow. Most people are afraid of big changes in their lives, but this light rail station and the proposed changes to the Future Land Use Map are an opportunity for those of us who live in this area to become part of something

Attachment A

larger. The human race cannot survive for long on this planet if we spread automobile-dependent suburbia across its surface. We must congregate in walkable urban nodes, with mass-transit connections, if we are to thrive as a species.

5. How would the proposed change comply with the community vision statements, goals, objectives, and policies of the Comprehensive Plan? Please include any data, research, or reasoning that supports the proposed amendments.

These changes will reduce urban sprawl by encouraging development within the city instead of at the suburban fringe. They will make efficient use of the major investment of light rail, incredibly reducing the denizens' dependence on automobiles. Renters who live in the area will have an expanded choice of housing. By creating new urban villages near this light rail station, development will be focused here, while letting the single-family areas further away remain unchanged. The proposed changes will improve the overall quality of life in Seattle and the region, for generations to come.

6. Is there public support for this proposed text amendments (i.e. have you conducted community meetings, etc.)? Note: The City will provide a public participation process, public notice, and environmental review for all applications.

No public meetings have addressed these particular changes to the Future Land Use Map. The Seattle City Council, however, recently adopted Resolution 31368 urging Sound Transit to study a light rail station at Northeast 130th Street. The natural result of a light rail station would be a significant change in the surrounding land use.

### **Criteria for Comprehensive Plan Amendment Selection (from Resolution 30662)**

The following criteria will be used in determining which proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments will be given further consideration:

- A. The amendment or policy is appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan because:
- The amendment is not appropriate as a regulatory measure, and warrants a Comprehensive Plan amendment;
  - The amendment is not better addressed as a budgetary or programmatic decision;
  - The amendment is not better addressed through another planning process, such as neighborhood planning; or
  - The Growth Management Act (GMA) mandates the amendment as part of the 10-year update.
- B. The amendment is legal - the amendment meets existing state and local laws.

C. It is practical to consider the amendment because:

- The timing of the amendment is appropriate and Council will have sufficient information necessary to make an informed decision;
- City staff will be able to conduct sufficient analysis and to develop policy and any related development regulations within the available time frame;
- The proposed amendment is consistent with the overall vision of the Comprehensive Plan and well-established Comprehensive Plan policy, or the Mayor or Council is interested in significantly changing existing policy;
- The amendment has not been recently rejected; and
- If the proposed change is to neighborhood plan policies, there has been a neighborhood review process to develop the proposal, or a neighborhood review process can be conducted prior to final Council consideration of the amendment.

